

### REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 4, 2004, claim 1-10, 13-15, and 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,663 (Gleason); and claims 11, 12, and 16 were rejected under § 103 over Gleason in view of RFC 2543, Handley, "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol."

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not disclosed by Gleason. The Office Action cited the nested delimiters described in column 7, lines 29-48, of Gleason as teaching the subject matter recited in claim 1. Nesting of delimiters as described in Gleason is not the same as setting pairs of delimiters as starting and closing indicators to *turn off any delimiter* occurring in a first string between the starting and closing indicators, as recited in claim 1. The nesting of delimiters as described in Gleason actually is contrary to what is recited in claim 1. The nested delimiters (which are provided between other delimiters) of Gleason still are treated as delimiters by the encoding/decoding function described in Gleason. An example of nested delimiters is shown in column 21, lines 4-7, of Gleason. In Gleason, the example delimiters provided include "{" and "}". The nested "{" and "}" delimiters shown in the example in column 21, lines 4-7, act as delimiters to define values for respective tags (*e.g.*, RF, DF, MS, MT, etc.). The nested delimiters of Gleason are clearly treated as delimiters, and are *not* turned off, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Gleason. Claim 6, which has been amended to *broaden* the scope of the claim, also is not anticipated by Gleason, since Gleason does not teach setting a pair of constraints to *turn off any delimiter* occurring within the pair of constraints.

Independent claim 9 is not anticipated by Gleason since Gleason does not teach a parser engine to parse a message by defining a plurality of sets of starting constraints and closing constraints, and treating any delimiter between each set of starting and closing constraints as a *non-delimiter*.

Independent claims 13, 17, 20, 21, and 23 are allowable over Gleason for reasons similar to those for claims 1, 6, or 9.

Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 24-30, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. In view of the Applicant's arguments above regarding the allowability of base claims over Gleason, it is also respectfully

Appln. Serial No. 09/428,808  
Amendment Dated January 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action Mailed October 4, 2004

submitted that dependent claim 11, 12, and 16 are not obvious over Gleason and RFC 2543. Applicant reserves the right to argue that no motivation or suggestion existed to combine the teachings of Gleason and RFC 2543 in the manner proposed by the Office Action.

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0014US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Jan. 3, 2005



\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan C. Hu  
Registration No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
Telephone: (713) 468-8880  
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883